BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.

receiving, from the client computer, an indication of approval of the proposed transportation plan; and

responsive to receiving the indication of approval, arranging transportation according to the transportation plan.

36. The computer implemented method of claim 35, wherein the step of receiving an activity indicator includes the step of receiving a scheduled activity from a personal information manager.

Please add the following new claim 37:

37. The computer implemented method of claim 35, wherein the activity indicator includes a plurality of transportation parameters and wherein the step of developing a proposed transportation plan includes developing, at the host computer, a proposed transportation plan corresponding to the received plurality of transportation parameters.

REMARKS

In the November 26, 2002 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-36 pending in the application. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, Applicant amends claims 1-9, 11, 12, 16-20, 22, 27, and 32-36 and adds new claim 37 for consideration. Support for the amended claims and new claim may be found in the originally filed specification, and thus, no new matter is added by this amendment. Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-37 (5 independent claims; 37 total claims) remain pending in the application. Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that "the claims do not meet the Court's definition of a 'statutory process'." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1-9, 11, and 32-36 to further clarify the invention and to show that the presently claimed invention includes a computer implemented method and each step includes communication between, or analysis by, a computer system to develop a tangible result and new information.

Thus, the presently claimed invention clearly provides a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended dependent claims 33 and 34 to show dependency to independent claim 32. Previously, the dependent claims 33 and 34 incorrectly claimed dependency to claim 29. All elements of the presently claimed invention have proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 12, 27-29, 31-32, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Garback, U.S. Patent No. 5,237,499, issued August 17, 1993 (hereinafter "Garback") in view of DeLorme et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040, issued September 7,1999 (hereinafter "DeLorme"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Garback discloses a computer based system configured for limited processing of travel requests directed to a specific venue from individual members of a sponsored group. The system includes a venue file that contains information regarding the specific venue. In addition, the system includes information for each individual member of the group and information on pre-selected vendors of various travel services. An individual may enter a travel request via a computer that is connected to a variety of airline CRS systems. The individual enters the travel request by entering various information (see Figure 3) such as a venue code, departure city, departure date and time, destination city, and return data and time. Using information from the venue file that matches the venue code, the airline, hotel, and ground transportation vendors are selected. (Col. 6, lines 11-27) An itinerary is then booked which relies on the pre-selected vendors. (Col. 5, lines 49-50) The Garback system also provides for making a price comparison between negotiated fares from the pre-selected vendors (col. 5, lines 41-56), but it does not identify an airport based on an activity location. In addition, as noted by the Examiner, Garback does not disclose or suggest a system that includes an activity location or an activity time.

DeLorme generally discloses a computerized travel reservation system that generates "map ticket" output in various media, for guidance and transactions en route. The Examiner asserts that DeLorme provides for "an itinerary planning tool which allows for the entry of activity locations and times, see figure 1C (167) for the benefit of providing detail for an itinerary planner within a geographical location system." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the information shown at figure 1C (167) of DeLorme. The DeLorem system uses this information to provide map annotations that show "topical

information" (*i.e.*, "What/Who data") and "temporal information" (*i.e.*, "When data"). (Col. 25, lines 4-35). However, this information is not in any way used by the DeLorme system to identify airports that are near an activity location.

In contrast to Garback and DeLorme, the presently claimed invention has a completely different purpose in that it receives activity information for a particular activity and the activity information is then used by complex hardware and software to identify airports or transportation destinations that are within a threshold measurement of the activity location. In other words, the system and method of the presently claimed invention does not utilize airport location information provided by individual. Rather, it utilizes complex hardware and software to identify an appropriate airport for an activity location that is within a threshold measurement such as distance or time. In contrast to the presently claimed invention, the cited references find an airport based on an airport code identified by the user or list a plurality of airports for the user to select (see discussion of DeMarcken below). Prior art systems may list airports for a given location such as Annapolis, MD, and then the user may choose from the list of airports such as BWI airport, Dulles airport, National airport, but the prior art systems will not identify an airport using threshold measurements to an activity location as recited by the presently claimed invention. For example, as stated by amended independent claim 1, "an activity indicator including an activity location and an activity start time" is received from a client computer (see 115 and 120 of Figure 1). In addition, the activity indicator is used by complex hardware and software to identify "a first airport, the first airport being within a first threshold measurement of the activity location, wherein the first threshold measurement comprises at least one of a walking distance, a set distance, and a time threshold." The identification of an airport that is within a threshold measurement of an activity location is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the Garback or DeLorme references. In addition, independent claims 12 and 32 recite a similar element of identifying an airport (or transportation destination as recited by independent claim 12) that is within a threshold measurement of an activity location. Similarly, independent claim 27 recites a processor that is used to "identify a plurality of transportation options wherein each of the plurality of transportation options arrives at the activity location prior to the activity time" and independent claim 35 recites developing "a proposed transportation plan corresponding to the received activity indicator." Furthermore, independent claims 1, 12, 27, and 32 are further distinguished from the cited references as these claims variously recite providing a best trip option for transportation from the origin to the activity location, wherein the best trip option includes the identified flight or transportation option. These elements of amended independent

claims 1, 12, 27, 32 and 35 are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Garback or DeLorme Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32 and 35 may be found in the originally filed specification, and no new matter has been introduced.

In addition, the prior art contains no suggestion or motivation to supply the missing elements of independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35. Thus, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to produce the presently claimed invention, even if they had knowledge of the prior art.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that each and every element of amended independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35 would not have been obvious over Garback in view of DeLorme. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal to rejection of claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35 (and claims 28, 29, and 31 which variously depend from independent claim 27) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 2-11, 13-26, 30, 33-34, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Garback in view of DeLorme and further in view of DeMarcken, U.S. Patent No. 6,275,808 B1, issued August 14, 2001 (hereinafter "DeMarcken"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As stated above, Garback and DeLorme fail to disclose, teach, or suggest receiving activity information for a particular activity and then using the activity information to identify airports or transportation destinations that are within a threshold measurement of the activity location as variously recited by independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35 (see above). DeMarcken contains no suggestion or motivation to supply the missing elements of the independent claims.

DeMarcken discloses a specific airline travel planning system. The user of the travel planning system will either enter an airport code or a location such as a city, region or country. (see col. 59, lines 53-56) If the user enters a location, then a listing of airports in a region about the location is displayed and the pricing solutions would be determined for the various combinations of the flights between for the displayed airports. However, DeMarcken does not disclose, teach, or suggest using activity information for a specific activity to identify airports or transportation destinations that are within a threshold measurement of the activity location as variously recited by independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35 (see above). Indeed, as noted by the Examiner, DeMarcken is simply cited to show "a display of multiple airports and a plurality of flights associated with the airports."

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that each and every element of amended independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35 would not have been obvious over Garback in view of DeLorme and further in view of DeMarcken. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal to rejection of claims 2-11, 13-26, 30, 33-34, and 36 (each of which variously depend from independent claims 1, 12, 27, 32, and 35) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Office wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the form of the claims, then the Office is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 26-FEB-2003

By: David O. Caplan

David O. Caplan
Reg. No. 41,655

Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
(602) 382-6284

APPENDIX SHOWING AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS

1. (AMENDED) [An electronic] A computer implemented method for managing transportation from an origin location, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving, from a client computer, an activity indicator including an activity location and an activity start time;

identifying, at a host computer, [at least] a first airport, the first airport being within a first threshold measurement of the activity location, wherein the first threshold measurement comprises at least one of a walking distance, a set distance, and a time threshold; [and]

identifying, at the host computer, [at least] a first departing flight associated with the [at least] the first airport, the identified [at least a first] departing flight associated with a flight arrival time and the first departing flight being [at least] between the [original] origin location and [the at least] the first airport;

wherein the flight arrival time of the [at least the] first identified operating flight is prior to the activity start time; and

providing, at the host computer, a best trip option for transportation from the origin location to the activity location, wherein the best trip option includes the first identified operating flight.

2. (AMENDED) The [electronic] computer implemented method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying the [at least the] first airport includes the step of identifying a plurality of airports and wherein the step of identifying the [at least the] first departing flight includes the step of identifying a plurality of flights associated with each of the plurality of airports.

3. (AMENDED) The computer implemented method of claim 2, wherein each of the identified plurality of flights is associated with a characteristic data item, the method further comprising the steps of:

comparing, at the host computer, the characteristic data item for each of the identified plurality of flights with a flight preference; and

ranking, at the host computer, each of the identified plurality of flights according to the flight preference.

4. (AMENDED) The computer implemented method of claim 3, wherein the step of comparing the characteristic data item includes the step of comparing the flight price for each of the identified plurality of flights with a flight price maximum; and wherein the step of ranking each of the identified plurality of flights includes the step of ranking each of the identified plurality of flights according to the comparison of the flight price to the flight price maximum.

5. (AMENDED) The [electronic] computer implemented method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying [at least] the first departing flight includes the steps of:

calculating a travel time between the [at least the] first airport associated with the [at least the] first departing flight and the activity location; and

determining an activity location arrival time, the activity location arrival time indicating a summation of the flight arrival time and the calculated travel time;

wherein the determined activity location arrival time is prior to or equivalent to the activity start time.

A1 Cont'd

6. (AMENDED) The [electronic] computer implemented method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying [at least] the first departing flight includes the steps of:

calculating a travel time between the [at least the] first airport associated with the [at least the] first departing flight and the activity location; and

determining an earliest flight arrival time, the earliest flight arrival time representing the result of subtracting the calculated ground travel time from the activity start time;

wherein the arrival time of the [at least the] first flight is prior to or simultaneous with the determined earliest flight arrival time.

7. (AMENDED) The [electronic] computer implemented method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

receiving, at the host computer, an activity stop time indicator, the activity stop time indicator indicating a stop time for the activity; and

[identify at least] identifying, at the host computer, a first returning flight, the [at least the] first returning flight associated with a flight departure time and being [at least] between the [at least the] first airport and the origin location;

wherein the flight departure time of the identified [at least the] first returning flight is subsequent to the stop time for the activity.

a1 cont'd

8. (AMENDED) The [electronic] computer implemented method of claim 7, further comprising the steps of:

determining, at the host computer, if the flight arrival time of the identified [at least the] first departing flight is on a first day and if the flight departure time of the identified [at least the] first returning flight is on a second day;

responsive to determining that the flight arrival time of the identified [at least the] first departing flight is on the first day and that the flight departure time of the identified [at least the] first returning flight is on the second day, identifying, at the host computer, a plurality of lodging locations within a lodging threshold distance of at least one of the [at least the] first airport and the activity location.

9. (AMENDED) The method of claim 8, further comprising the step of:

reserving [at least] one of the identified plurality of lodging locations.

---

11. (AMENDED) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of identifying [at least] the first airport includes the step of identifying the [at least the] first airport, the [at least the] first airport being within a temporal threshold measurement of the activity location.

a2

12. (AMENDED) A computer system for managing transportation based upon a transportation indicator that includes a location and an arrival start time, the computer system comprising:

a processor;

a storage device connected to the processor, the storage device for storing instructions executable by the processor;

a plurality of instructions stored on the storage device, the plurality of instructions configured to cause the processor to:

identify [at least] a first transportation destination, the first transportation destination being within a first threshold measurement of the location, wherein the first threshold measurement comprises at least one of a walking distance, a set distance, and a time threshold; and

identify [at least] a first departing option associated with the [at least the] first transportation destination, the identified [at least a] first departing option associated with an option arrival time and the first departing option including transportation between a transportation origin and the first transportation destination;

wherein the option arrival time of the [at least the] first identified departing option is prior to the activity start time; and

provide a best trip option for transportation to the location, wherein the best trip option includes the first identified departing option.

a2 Contd

16. (AMENDED) The computer system of claim 12, wherein the plurality of instructions are for causing the processor to:

calculate a travel time between the [at least the] first transportation destination associated with the [at least the] first departing option and the location; and

determine a location arrival time, the location arrival time indicating a summation of the transportation option arrival time and the calculated travel time.

a3

17. (AMENDED) The computer system of claim 12, wherein the plurality of instructions are for causing the processor to:

calculate a travel time between the [at least the] first transportation destination associated with the [at least the] first departing option and the location; and

determine an earliest option arrival time, the earliest option arrival time representing the result of subtracting the calculated travel time from the activity start time.

18. (AMENDED) The computer system of claim 12, wherein the plurality of instructions are for causing the processor to:

identify [at least] a first returning option, the [at least the] first returning option associated with a option departure time and being [at least] between the [at least the] first transportation destination and the transportation origin;

wherein the option departure time of the identified [at least the] first returning option is subsequent to a stop time for the activity; and

wherein the best trip option further includes the first returning option.

19. (AMENDED) The computer system of claim 18, wherein the plurality of instructions are for causing the processor to:

determine if the option arrival time of the identified [at least the] first departing option is on a first day and if the option departure time of the identified [at least the] first returning option is on a second day;

a3 Contd

responsive to determining that the option arrival time of the identified [at least the] first departing option is on the first day and that the option departure time of the identified [at least the] first returning option is on the second day, identify a plurality of lodging locations within a lodging threshold distance of the location.

20. (AMENDED) The computer system of claim 19, wherein the plurality of instructions are for causing the processor to:

reserve [at least] one of the identified plurality of lodging locations.

---

22. (AMENDED) The computer system of claim 12, wherein the plurality of instructions are for causing the processor to:

a4

rank the [at least the] first transportation origin according to its temporal distance from the location.

---

27. (AMENDED) A computer system for planning transportation, the computer system comprising:

a processor for executing instructions;

a first storage device for storing an activity indicator, the activity indicator

a5

indicating [at least] an activity time and an activity location;

a second storage device connected to the processor, the storage device for storing instructions that are executable by the processor; and

a plurality of instructions stored on the second storage device, the plurality of instructions for causing the processor to:

identify a plurality of transportation options wherein each of the plurality of transportation options arrives at the activity location prior to the activity time;

95 Contd

provide a best trip option for transportation to the activity location, wherein the best trip option includes a first of the plurality of transportation options; and

reserve [a] the first of the plurality of transportation options.

---

32. (AMENDED) [An] A computer implemented method for receiving an electronic signal from [an] a first electronic device at a second electronic device, the electronic signal capable of activating [another] the second electronic device, wherein the [another] second electronic device is [response] responsive to the electronic signal to thereby perform steps for managing transportation from an origin location, the steps comprising:

receiving, at the second electronic device, an activity indicator including an activity location and an activity start time;

identifying, at the second electronic device, [at least] a first airport, the first airport being within a first threshold measurement of the activity location, wherein the first threshold measurement comprises at least one of walking distance, a set distance, and a time threshold; and

96

identifying, at the second electronic device, [at least] a first departing flight associated with the [at least the] first airport, the identified [at least a] first departing flight associated with a flight arrival time and being [at least] between the origin location and the [at least the] first airport;

wherein the flight arrival time of the [at least the] first identified flight is prior to the activity start time; and

providing, at the second electronic device, a best trip option for transportation from the origin location to the activity location, wherein the best trip option includes the first identified departing flight.

33. (AMENDED) The computer implemented method [electronic signal] of claim [29] 32, wherein the [another] second electronic device is responsive to the electronic signal to thereby perform steps comprising:

calculating, at the second electronic device, a travel time between the [at least the] first airport associated with the [at least the] first departing flight and the activity location; and

determining, at the second electronic device, an activity location arrival time, the activity location arrival time indicating a summation of the flight arrival time and the calculated travel time;

wherein the determined activity location arrival time is prior to or equivalent to the activity start time.

34. (AMENDED) The computer implemented method [electronic signal] of claim [29] 32, wherein the [another] second electronic device is responsive to the electronic signal to thereby perform steps comprising:

calculating, at the second electronic device, a travel time between the [at least the] first airport associated with the [at least the] first departing flight and the activity location; and

determining, at the second electronic device, an earliest flight arrival time, the earliest flight arrival time representing the result of subtracting the calculated ground travel time from the activity start time;

wherein the arrival time of the at least the first flight is prior to or simultaneous with the determined earliest flight arrival time.

A6 Cont'd

35. (AMENDED) [An electronic] A computer implemented method for planning transportation, the [electronic] computer implemented method comprising the steps of:

receiving, from a client computer, an activity indicator [including a plurality of transportation parameters];

developing, at a host computer, a proposed transportation plan corresponding to the received activity indicator [plurality of transportation parameters];

transmitting [at least] to the client computer an indication of the proposed transportation plan;

receiving, from the client computer, an indication of approval of the proposed transportation plan; and

responsive to receiving the indication of approval, arranging transportation according to the transportation plan.

36. (AMENDED) The [electronic] computer implemented method of claim 35, wherein the step of receiving an activity indicator includes the step of receiving a scheduled activity from a personal information manager.

37. (NEW) The computer implemented method of claim 35, wherein the activity indicator includes a plurality of transportation parameters and wherein the step of developing a proposed transportation plan includes developing, at the host computer, a proposed transportation plan corresponding to the received plurality of transportation parameters.